

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
STATESVILLE DIVISION**

RAMONA WINEBARGER and REX WINEBARGER,
Plaintiffs,

**CASE NOS. 5:15CV57-RLV;
3:15CV211-RLV**

v.
BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,
Defendant

MARTHA CARLSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION
Defendants

**PLAINTIFFS OBJECTIONS AND COUNTER DESIGNATIONS TO DEFENDANT
BOSTON SCIENTIFIC'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF JANICE CONNOR
TAKEN AUGUST 13/14, 2013**

BSC Designation	Objection	Plaintiffs Counter Designation
jc081413, (Pages 464:8 to 475:22) 6 Q. Since you've been in the position in women's 7 health, has Boston Scientific funded and supported 8 clinical research related to its sling medical devices 9 to treat stress urinary incontinence? 10 A. So since I started in 2009, we have had a very 11 robust program for managing ISRs, which are 12 investigator-sponsored research studies. So these are 13 the funded studies that Boston Scientific provides 14 dollars for to independent researchers. So we've had a	467:6-16 FRE 403 confusing and misleading	

<p>15 robust program since 2009 that continues today with</p> <p>16 increased funding through the years.</p> <p>***</p> <p>jc081413, (Pages 467:17 to 468:3)</p> <p>467</p> <p>17 Q. And then same question with regard to Boston</p> <p>18 Scientific's products to treat pelvic organ prolapse,</p> <p>19 the Pinnacle and Uphold lines.</p> <p>20 Since you've been in the director of clinical</p> <p>21 programs, has Boston Scientific funded and supported</p> <p>22 clinical programs to investigate those products?</p> <p>23 A. For pelvic organ prolapse?</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>468</p> <p>1 A. Absolutely. So there are approximately nine</p> <p>2 active studies right now with many of those studies on</p> <p>3 the pelvic organ prolapse products.</p> <p>***</p> <p>15 Q. I want to talk about the medical devices that</p> <p>16 you've been involved with in women's health to treat</p> <p>17 stress urinary incontinence, Boston Scientific slings.</p> <p>18 What are those devices?</p> <p>19 A. So for our slings right now we have Advantage</p> <p>20 sling, we have Lynx, Prefyx, Obtryx, and Solyx.</p> <p>***</p> <p>16 Q. For all of those devices, the sling devices</p> <p>17 that you mentioned and the treatments, the medical</p> <p>18 devices to treat pelvic organ prolapse, were those</p> <p>19 cleared by the FDA prior to you coming into the women's</p> <p>20 health division?</p> <p>21 A. When I started in April '09, all of those</p> <p>22 devices were currently on the market.</p>	<p>467:17-468:3 FRE 401, 402, 403</p> <p>474:15-20 FRE 403 confusing and misleading</p> <p>475:16-22 FRE 401; 403 Irrelevant and misleading reference to FDA</p>	
---	--	--

<p>jc081413, (Pages 476:1 to 478:2)</p> <p>4 Are there studies in the published literature</p> <p>5 on all of Boston Scientific slings and pelvic</p> <p>organ</p> <p>6 prolapse medical devices?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, there are. So one of my</p> <p>responsibilities</p> <p>8 is to monitor that literature. So there are today</p> <p>over</p> <p>9 50 studies published on our stress urinary</p> <p>incontinence</p> <p>10 devices as well as our pelvic organ prolapse kits.</p> <p>11 Q. And for each one of the devices that we</p> <p>12 mentioned, are there studies looking -- clinical</p> <p>trials,</p> <p>13 clinical studies looking at the safety and</p> <p>effectiveness</p> <p>14 of each one of those devices?</p> <p>15 A. Absolutely. So a lot of these studies, as I</p> <p>16 was explaining, for research they have -- they</p> <p>might</p> <p>17 have different objectives, so they might be</p> <p>studying</p> <p>18 these devices in a certain patient population.</p> <p>19 I know there's a study on women who are</p> <p>20 traumatized. There's a study published on</p> <p>sexually</p> <p>21 traumatized women. And they were using the</p> <p>device as --</p> <p>22 that's an example of a certain population.</p> <p>23 They have studies on patients who have</p> <p>had</p> <p>24 previous failures for these devices.</p> <p>477</p> <p>1 So there are many studies of different</p> <p>patient</p> <p>2 populations, but they're all on the overall</p> <p>outcomes,</p> <p>3 which include the safety and effectiveness.</p> <p>4 Q. So for each one of Boston Scientific's</p>	<p>476:4-477:8</p> <p>FRE 403</p> <p>Confusing</p> <p>and</p> <p>misleading</p>	

<p>5 slings -- Advantage, Lynx, Prefyx, Obtryx, and Solyx --</p> <p>6 are there clinical studies looking at the safety and</p> <p>7 effectiveness of each one of those devices?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, there are.</p> <p>***</p> <p>15 Q. And are there multiple studies looking at the</p> <p>16 safety and effectiveness of these slings and these</p> <p>17 treatments for pelvic organ prolapse?</p> <p>18 A. Correct. So we do have on file at Boston</p> <p>19 Scientific a list of these studies. There are --</p> <p>20 again, they're included in our clinical documents to</p> <p>21 summarize the safety and effectiveness of these devices.</p> <p>22 We also use these studies to support these products for</p> <p>23 other country approvals. So we do have many studies</p> <p>24 on file in-house that we monitor that are published.</p>	<p>477:15-24 FRE 401; 403 Irrelevant and misleading reference to foreign regulatory process. Misleading and confusing as it cofilates POP and SUI devices.</p>	
<p>jc081413, (Pages 495:10 to 498:18) 495</p> <p>10 Q. Now, I want to talk about the Uphold device,</p> <p>11 Boston Scientific's Uphold device that's used to</p> <p>12 treat pelvic organ prolapse.</p> <p>13 What is Exhibit 534?</p> <p>14 A. Exhibit 534 is a published study in the</p> <p>15 journal of international urogynecology in 2012 by Dr.</p> <p>16 Vu and his coauthors of 115 patients. And this was at a</p> <p>17 single center. This is in Chicago, Illinois. These</p> <p>18 patients were treated with the Uphold device and were</p> <p>19 followed --</p> <p>20 I believe they're followed out to a year at a</p> <p>21 minimum.</p> <p>22 And they reported on their anatomic</p> <p>23 outcomes.</p> <p>24 He also had collected data on quality-of-life,</p> <p>which we</p>		<p>jc081413, (Pages 549:17 to 550:5) 549</p> <p>17 Q. Now, take out 534.</p> <p>This is a study titled</p> <p>18 "Minimal mesh repair for</p> <p>apical and anterior prolapse</p> <p>19 initial anatomical and</p> <p>subjective outcomes."</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. And among the</p> <p>authors on that study is a</p> <p>22 Dr. Vu.</p> <p>23 A. Vu.</p> <p>24 Q. Vu out of Fort</p> <p>Worth?</p> <p>550</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And the last author</p> <p>listed is</p> <p>3 Roger P. Goldberg, who</p> <p>we've talked about a lot.</p> <p>4 Correct?</p>

<p>22 talked about before. So one of those questionnaires was</p> <p>23 the pelvic floor distress inventory, which again</p> <p>24 patients record information on how their pelvic floor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">496</p> <p>1 disease basically impacts their daily life.</p> <p>2 They also had completed a questionnaire called</p> <p>3 the "surgical satisfaction questionnaire," which</p> <p>4 includes questions about will they recommend the surgery</p> <p>5 to their friends, to their mothers, daughters, and would</p> <p>6 they do the surgery again.</p> <p>7 Q. And what did the results from those --</p> <p>8 collecting that data on quality-of-life, what was that?</p> <p>9 A. So what the results show that 93 percent of the</p> <p>10 women who completed the surgical satisfaction</p> <p>11 questionnaire reported they were satisfied and they</p> <p>12 would choose the surgery again.</p> <p>13 Q. Did the study look at rates of mesh exposure?</p> <p>14 A. They did. So they did measure rates of mesh</p> <p>15 exposure. So the rate in this clinical study was</p> <p>16 2.6 percent.</p> <p>17 Q. Finally, could you read the author's conclusion</p> <p>18 in the abstract there.</p> <p>19 A. Sure. "This technique resulted in successful</p> <p>20 outcomes within both anterior and apical compartments</p> <p>21 with a low rate of mesh complications, and no cases</p> <p>22 requiring mesh removal or hospital readmission. High</p> <p>23 rates of satisfaction and improved condition- specific</p> <p>24 quality-of-life were observed."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">497</p> <p>1 Q. And those are good results and good</p> <p>2 conclusions?</p> <p>3 A. Those are good results, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And do you agree that the author's conclusions</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">497:4-14</p>	<p>5 A. <i>Correct.</i></p>
---	---	-----------------------------

<p>5 flow from the data that they collected in the study?</p> <p>6 A. I do agree. So he had actually also looked at</p> <p>7 patients who've had a uterus and who had a previous</p> <p>8 hysterectomy, so patients without a uterus and those who</p> <p>9 do. And their rates are over 95 percent for their</p> <p>10 anatomic success. So that is very positive data.</p> <p>11 Q. And does this study establish that Boston</p> <p>12 Scientific's Uphold device is a safe and effective</p> <p>13 option?</p> <p>14 A. It does. Absolutely.</p> <p>15 Q. And are there other published studies that</p> <p>16 look at the Uphold -- Boston Scientific's Uphold</p> <p>17 device?</p> <p>18 A. There are, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And are those studies published?</p> <p>20 A. There are. There are many more</p> <p>21 upcoming</p> <p>22 studies ongoing now and that are in the process</p> <p>23 of being</p> <p>24 printed.</p> <p>Q. Are there other studies that look at the Uphold</p> <p>device that establish that it's a safe and effective</p> <p>option?</p> <p>498</p> <p>1 A. Yes, there are.</p> <p>2 Q. Has Boston Scientific stopped studying its</p> <p>--</p> <p>3 these devices, these slings and POP devices?</p> <p>4 A. No. So we have -- as I mentioned before,</p> <p>that</p> <p>5 robust ISR program, so that is still ongoing.</p> <p>6 We've just approved recently over \$2</p> <p>million</p> <p>7 grant for a research trial on Uphold LITE. So</p> <p>that is</p> <p>8 ongoing.</p> <p>9 There are many other studies on Uphold.</p> <p>For</p> <p>10 example, there's a Pinnacle study ongoing as</p> <p>well. We</p> <p>11 have a Solyx study that's being presented -- I</p> <p>think I</p> <p>12 mentioned that -- in the fall.</p> <p>13 We also have three very large studies, over</p> <p>400</p>	<p>FRE 401; 402; 403; 701; 702.</p> <p>497:15- 498:1 FRE 401, 402, 403, 701, 702 Confusing and Misleading</p> <p>498:2-18 FRE 401; 403 Ongoing clinical trials and recently funded clinical trials on other products are irrelevant to BSC's conduct in 2010 regarding the Uphold.</p>	
---	--	--

<p>14 patients each, that will be -- one just started in the</p> <p>15 Solyx sling with the Obtryx sling. That study started</p> <p>16 and will go on for many years, outwards of five years.</p> <p>17 And there's an Uphold study and there's a Xenform study.</p> <p>18 So no. There's many studies ongoing now.</p>		
<p>jc081413, (Pages 498:23 to 499:3)</p> <p>498</p> <p>23 Q. Are there published studies, some that we've</p> <p>24 looked at and others, that establish that Boston</p> <p>499</p> <p>1 Scientific's Pinnacle and Uphold devices are safe and</p> <p>2 effective options?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p>	<p>498:23-499:3 FRE 401; 402, 403, 701;702</p>	
<p>jc081413, (Pages 501:5 to 503:5)</p> <p>20 Q. And then if there are individual reports, will</p> <p>21 Boston Scientific get those and report those to the FDA</p> <p>22 if that's -- if they qualified under the FDA</p> <p>23 regulations?</p> <p>24 A. Yep. That's correct.</p>	<p>502:20-24 FRE 401; 403 Irrelevant FDA reference</p>	
<p>jc081413, (Page 567:1 to 567:14)</p> <p>1 Q. The studies that you talked about to the jury</p> <p>2 that we marked as exhibits, do you personally believe</p> <p>3 those studies support the safety and effectiveness of</p> <p>4 Boston Scientific's SUI and pelvic organ prolapse</p> <p>5 devices?</p> <p>6 A. I do.</p>	<p>567:1-6 FRE 401; 402; 403; 701;702</p>	

DATED: June 26, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

TRACEY & FOX LAW FIRM

/s/ Sean Tracey

Sean Patrick Tracey

State Bar No. 20176500

Shawn P. Fox

State Bar No. 24040926

Clint Casperson
State Bar No. 24075561
440 Louisiana, Suite 1901
Houston, TX 77002
(800) 925-7216
(866) 709-2333
stracey@tracelawfirm.com
sfox@tracelawfirm.com
ccasperson@tracelawfirm.com

/s/ John R. Fabry
John R. Fabry
Texas Bar No. 06768480
Mark R. Mueller
Texas Bar No. 14623500
MUELLER LAW, PLLC
404 West 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 478-1236
(512) 478-1473 (Facsimile)
John.Fabry@muellerlaw.com
Mark@muellerlaw.com
Meshservice@muellerlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 26, 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the CM/ECF participants registered to receive service in this MDL.

TRACEY & FOX LAW FIRM

/s/ Sean Tracey

Sean Patrick Tracey

State Bar No. 2176500

Shawn P. Fox

Clint Casperson

State Bar No. 24075561

State Bar No. 24040926

440 Louisiana, Suite 1901

Houston, TX 77002

(800) 925-7216

(866) 709-2333

stracey@traceylawfirm.com

sfox@traceylawfirm.com

ccasperson@traceylawfirm.com

/s/ John R. Fabry

John R. Fabry

Texas Bar No. 06768480

Mark R. Mueller

Texas Bar No. 14623500

MUELLER LAW, PLLC

404 West 7th Street

Austin, TX 78701

(512) 478-1236

(512) 478-1473 (Facsimile)

John.Fabry@muellerlaw.com

Mark@muellerlaw.com

Meshservice@muellerlaw.com